

Action Item

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Approval of the Minutes of the April 9, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

Educational Policy and Programs Committee

Meeting of April 9, 2002

Committee members present Evonne Seron Schulze, *Chair*
Odessa P. Johnson, *Vice Chair*
Rachel E. Shetka
Howard Welinsky
Alan S. Arkatov, *ex officio*

Other Commissioners present
Robert L. Moore
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.

Committee members absent William D. Campbell
Irwin S. Field
Susan Hammer
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Melinda G. Wilson
Carol Chandler, *ex officio*

Call to order and approval of the minutes Committee Chair Schulze called the Educational Policy and Programs Committee to order at 10:35 a.m. She proposed a motion to approve the minutes of the Educational Policy and Programs meeting of February 4, 2002. It was seconded and unanimously approved.

Report on proposed revisions to the guidelines for review of proposed university campuses, community colleges, and educational and joint-use centers Committee Chair Schulze introduced staff member Gil Velazquez, noting that he had prepared a table contrasting the proposed and existing guidelines, which she had found very helpful.

Mr. Velazquez reported that the changes since the preceding draft of the guidelines were summarized in introduction and that the most substantive change was in providing for the establishment of noncredit community college centers.

Mr. Velazquez noted that there was no record of opposition to the guidelines. He said they are the result of deliberations with interested parties going back two or possibly three years. The document sets the planning framework for new college campuses. The staff's recommendation is to approve the guidelines with the changes as noted.

Chair Schulze said that the guidelines are of great importance, since they will be there for the segments to follow and that she was pleased that the Commission was nearing a final report.

Mr. Velazquez said that since 1975, the original year that the Commission issued guidelines, there had been changes in 1978, and 1992.

Vice Chair Johnson said she was pleased to see provisions for development of non-credit community college centers, since this was important in furthering the Commission's public agenda. However, she was concerned that the language dealing with joint use facilities was cumbersome and may be inhibiting to applicants. She asked if that language could be condensed.

Mr. Velazquez responded that the decision of the workgroup was to start out with guidelines based on the process for a single segment and adapt it based on experience with actual joint use proposals. The guidelines should be regarded as an experimental model. He said staff recognized that all collaborations would be unique and the staff's intent was to encourage access. He said staff is considering expanding the membership of the workgroup to include representatives from faculty in addition to segmental facilities planners in order to develop more relevant and useful guidelines.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked if the provisions of adult education at K-12 schools were considered when reviewing proposals for noncredit community college centers. Mr. Velazquez replied that staff does not take into account all the workforce preparation programs. The intent was to advance economic development and ensure that all segments of the population have access to higher education, particularly that which explicitly focuses on workforce preparation.

Commission Chair Arkatov noted that in some urban districts, community college-level courses are offered extensively at K-12 adult schools and asked if this was an issue that should be addressed by the Commission. Commissioner Schulze noted that in San Diego and San Francisco, all the adult education was done by community colleges and there is none in K-12. She invited David Viar from the California League of Community Colleges to speak.

Mr. Viar noted that California has established that its public school and the community college districts should come to agreement as to which institution should offer adult education programs. The guidelines correctly recognize that in some areas of the State the local community college district is the lead organization in offering adult education, but that in others the school district takes the lead. These decisions are made locally and, when reviewing proposals, the Commission staff should be aware of such agreements.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked how these local agreements are reached. Mr. Viar said they were often based on long-standing practice in the area, reflecting the interests of the segments when adult programs were first started. In other cases, they were based on negotiations between the segments, either locally or between the Board of Governors and the Board of Education.

Mr. Moore noted that community-based organizations also had a role in workforce development and that there was room for greater coordination. One of the reasons for the initiative by Governor Gray Davis on workforce training was to get more cooperation between all the players involved. He said there had been great progress in this area.

Mr. Velazquez noted that the guidelines made reference only to State-funded, State-supported vocational education courses and did not cover community-based courses.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked if the guidelines cover the middle colleges program that takes high school students and puts them in community colleges. Mr. Velazquez replied that this is more appropriate for a joint use center where a partnership with high schools is possible.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that when the West Hills proposal first came to the Commission, it was stated that conversion to a campus was needed because there are certain things that a campus can offer that an education center cannot offer. He said the reasons for this view were not clear to him. He thought that all education centers should be able to offer the same serviced as those available at a campus and there is no reason for conversion to a full campus with the associated administrative costs. He said the guidelines should ask the fundamental questions of why it cannot be done in a different way.

Mr. Velazquez replied that one of the changes in the guidelines was to request more information to provide the Commission with a better gauge of costs and benefits. In addition, he hoped that the provisions for joint use centers would enable the segments to serve communities more economically.

Commissioner Rodriguez said that the Commission was supportive of joint use centers and wondered whether the guidelines could be made reinforced to state that any proposal for a campus or program must include an analysis of the potential for joint use and explain why when this direction is not chosen.

Mr. Velazquez said that before the Commission receives a fully developed Needs Study for a new campus or center, the letter of intent process must be completed. The guidelines now have a third requirement labeled the "preliminary notice" by which the Commission is put on notice that a Community College District, California State University or University of California campus plans to submit a letter of intent. This step gives the Commission more opportunity to provide comments to applicants early in the planning process. By approving the new guidelines, the Commission will insert itself in a very preliminary stage of the development of the proposed center.

Chair Schulze asked if Commissioner Rodriguez wanted us to specifically ask the question on joint use, rather than merely allow it to emerge from planning discussions. Commissioner Rodriguez noted that the new guidelines had more direction on join use than previously, but wondered if we should be even more explicit and require the applicant to make the case for not electing to pursue an approach of joint use.

Mr. Velazquez noted that another important issue is that the proposed revisions are a guideline-planning framework. If there is a future need for additional clarifying language concerning the costs and benefits of new centers and campuses, it could be accommodated in further guideline revisions. In addition, he said that there was often a political aspect to the establishment of new campuses and it was a challenge to develop specific language to deal with this issue.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the Commission asked for a cost-benefit analysis of a segment's choices. Mr. Velazquez replied that the Commission asked segments to explicitly justify the site that they had selected.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if this justification compared all options, such as expanding current sites; offering bus service, build a residential campus next to a current facility. Mr. Velazquez said that, in addition to the site cost-benefit analysis, the segment is asked why it needs to build a new campus rather than expanding an existing center.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the commission asked for overall operational budget and the extent to which guidelines address overall budget concerns. Mr. Velazquez replied that this is a new requirement in the guidelines and that in the case of community colleges capital outlay impacts on the district had to be addressed.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the effect on the operational budget of other institutions was addressed.

Mr. Velazquez replied that, traditionally, the guidelines had focused on capital outlay issues, but that the Commission's academic program review process addressed operational issues. The intent of the guidelines is to provide eligibility for capital outlay funds. However, operational budgets are an issue that would be dealt with more thoroughly in the next revision of the guidelines.

Executive Director Fox said that the Commission does ask about impacts on neighboring institutions and that perhaps we can revise the wording to address impacts on the system or the district. Mr. Velazquez said that the Commission would have to reconvene the workgroup to revise the guidelines.

Commissioner Chair Arkatov asked if what was the standard for addressing the role of technology in a proposal. Mr. Velazquez replied that the Needs Study must provide a discussion on the role of technology for a variety of purposes, such as outreach or providing distance education.

Commissioner Rodriguez encouraged the Committee to revise the guidelines to address these issues.

Chair Shulze proposed that Mr. Velazquez revise the guidelines in consultation with Commissioner Rodriguez before they were brought before the full Commission. She then asked for a motion for approval of the proposed guidelines subject to additional clarification.

Mr. Velazquez asked if the language on page 11 of the draft was sufficient to address Commissioner Rodriguez' and Commission Chair Arkatov's concerns.

Commissioner Rodriguez suggested an addition saying that if the policy of the governing institution is preventing a center from moving forward, the cost of changing the policy should be addressed. He said that in the case of West Hills, district policy limited the services that could be offered by a center.

Mr. Velazquez said that such a policy was not a consequence of the Commission's guidelines.

Commissioner Rodriguez added he would like to see a requirement for letters of support from other institutions in the same system. Mr. Velazquez noted that before the Commission revised a proposal, they must be fully approved internally by the proposing segment.

Chair Schulze said that any direction for additional information could be burdensome.

Deputy Director Leveille said that, before for any proposed California State University site is approved by the Board of Trustees, it is analyzed internally.

Commissioner Pesqueira explained that when San Marcos became a full State University campus, agreements on intersegmental impacts were made with the local community colleges. Similar agreements are in place for the Stockton California State University center.

Mr. Velazquez added that, before a needs study reaches the Commission, it has been reviewed extensively at the local level and at the segmental level.

Vice Chair Johnson then moved the item, which was unanimously approved.

**Needs analysis
review for the off-
campus higher
education center at
Otay Mesa
proposed by
Southwestern
Community
College District**

Mr. Velazquez introduced this information item and noted that the staff review was done in accordance with the 1992 guidelines. He noted that Southwestern Community College District had been very innovative in making efficient use of the San Ysidro center

Dr. Serafin Zasqueta of Southwestern Community College District said that the new center would offer learners in the area enhanced opportunities, improve quality of life in the area, provide collaborative use of facilities and articulated programs, and to provide workforce preparation in newly industrializing area. The district is working with CETIS and the Autonomous University of Mexico to create an international community.

Director Fox said that the Commission saw the benefit to learners of this arrangement and brought this message to the State level and that the center was a well-timed and well-placed development.

Commissioner Pesqueira noted that the center will serve a fast-growing area and there will be demand for more centers. He said the area has a motivated student body that is willing to attend classes at all hours. The center is the key to the future for the tens of thousands of people who live in the area.

Chair Schulze asked as a matter of record for San Diego Community College District to provide a letter of support for the center.

Commission Chair Arkatov said that the center makes access a reality for the area.

Mr. Velazquez thanked Dr. Zasqueta for the work done by his staff in this proposal.

Chair Schulze said that the Commission looked forward to coming to the groundbreaking.

**Performance
indicators of
California higher
education, 2001**

Staff member ZoAnn Laurente presented highlights from the 2001 Performance indicators report, noting it is the eighth in a series of annual reports established by AB 1801 (1991). In response to a question from Commissioner Izumi, she said that the information on Graph III-D (Estimated GPA of Public High School Graduates) came from the Commission's 1996 Eligibility Study and that data for 2001 would be available on completion of the 2001 Eligibility Study.

Commissioner Izumi suggested that the high school graduation rate from the Department of education be included in addition to the dropout rate.

Commissioner Moore said that UC had indicated that there was no reliable information on the graduation rates because the Department of Education had never collected the information needed to make an accurate estimate of that rate. Ms. Laurente replied that the report presents measures that have been agreed upon by the segments and if consensus can be reached on how to calculate graduation rates, this figure could be included in future issues.

Commissioner Moore asked several questions about the employment of the report's contents and how the material might affect future Commission work and legislation. He asked if the Commission staff can do the analysis, rather than merely presenting data

Vice Chair Johnson noted that the University of California data may not be accurate and Ms. Laurente confirmed that some data might be missing. Ms. Johnson said the between 1990 and 1995, University had significant fee increases and that, since then, Proposition 209 had discouraged underrepresented minorities. She said these developments might explain some of the trends shown.

Chair Shulze asked if there are questions that come up every year and noted that, when she was on the Community Colleges Board of Governors, there were always questions about not having data allowing them to estimate transfer to independent universities.

Commission Chair Arkatov said the points raised by Commissioner Moore were important and that he would prefer that the Commission lead the way in interpreting the data in the report. He said it would be helpful if staff could add a list of 10–20 most interesting things shown by the data and in order that staff could then lead the discussion on these issues.

Director Fox said that the plan was to use the data in the public agenda. He noted that the report was the result of legislation requiring the Commission to collect and report specific data.

Ms. Laurente said staff planned to proceed to publish the report in its present form since there was no dispute about the data and revised data would be included in subsequent printings.

Commission Chair Arkatov asked the subcommittee if there is any analysis that the commissioners would like staff to add to the report or any points that should be highlighted. Commissioner Welinsky said he would like to see a cover letter with critical trends.

Chair Shulze asked if such a letter would have to be reviewed by the Committee and expressed concern about the staff time needed to prepare a letter. Director Fox said it would be feasible to take a few points from the public agenda and show how the data relate to them.

Commissioner Singh and Commission Chair Arkatov concurred that this would be a product that is useful to the public. Commissioner Moore said that a letter would help

the Commission to influence critical issues and that the Commission should do more than merely submit data.

Deputy Director Leveille said that staff would draft a letter, share it with Chair Shulze and use it to transmit the report. He noted that the Commission has a statutory obligation to get the report to the Budget Committee. He added that staff would present a draft report at the June Commission meeting with highlights from this report and the student profiles and fiscal profiles reports. In addition, the data from and the Commission statistical reports can be used in other staff products.

Commissioner Pesqueira asked if the tables in Section IV on first time freshmen by ethnicity could be compiled into a single chart. Ms. Laurente and Committee Chair Shulze said that splitting data on related issues between tables might be unavoidable in this type of report.

Adjournment	Having no further business, Committee Chair Schulze adjourned the Educational Policy and Programs Committee at 12:00 p.m.
--------------------	---
